

Dirac particle in gravitational field

Milovan Vasilic* and Marko Vojinovic†
Institute of Physics, P.O.Box 57, 11001 Belgrade, Serbia

Classical dynamics of spinning zero-size objects in an external gravitational field is derived from the conservation law of the stress-energy and spin tensors. The resulting world line equations differ from those in the existing literature. In particular, the spin of the Dirac particle does not couple to the background curvature. As a check of consistency, the wave packet solution of the free Dirac equation is considered. The resulting equations are shown to include a constraint that relates the wave packet spin to its orbital angular momentum. In the zero-size limit, both contributions to the total angular momentum disappear simultaneously.

PACS numbers: 04.40.-b

Introduction. The problem of particle motion in external gravitational field is usually addressed by using the Mathisson-Papapetrou method [1, 2]. One starts with the covariant conservation law of the stress-energy tensor of matter fields, and analyzes it under the assumption that matter is highly localized in space. In the lowest, single-pole approximation, the moving matter is viewed as a point particle. In the pole-dipole approximation, its non-zero size is taken into account.

The results found in literature can be summarized as follows. Spinless particles in the single-pole approximation obey the geodesic equation. In the pole-dipole approximation, the rotational angular momentum of the localized matter couples to spacetime curvature, and produces geodesic deviations [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6]. If the particles have spin, the curvature couples to the total angular momentum [7, 8, 9, 10, 11].

What we are interested in is a consistent single-pole analysis of spinning particles in an external gravitational field. This is motivated by the observation that single-pole approximation eliminates the influence of particle thickness, and allows the derivation of the pure spin-curvature coupling. In fact, this is the only way to see the influence of curvature on the spin part of the total angular momentum. The ambiguous algebraic decomposition of the total angular momentum into spin and orbital contributions are of no help. What we need is a truly zero-size object. The existing literature on the subject turns out not to have this sort of prediction.

The results that we have obtained are summarized as follows. Trajectories of spinning zero-size massive particles generally deviate from the geodesic lines. The deviation is due to the spin-curvature and spin-torsion couplings. These turn out to be different from what has been believed so far. In particular, the spin of the free Dirac point particle does not couple to the curvature. If it is viewed as a wave packet solution of the Dirac equation, it does not couple to the torsion either. The Dirac point particles behave as spinless objects.

In what follows, we shall outline our derivation, and make the necessary comments. We begin with the covariant conservation of the fundamental matter currents—

stress-energy tensor $\tau^\mu{}_\nu$ and spin tensor $\sigma^\lambda{}_{\mu\nu}$:

$$(D_\rho + \mathcal{T}^\lambda{}_{\rho\lambda}) \tau^\rho{}_\mu = \tau^\nu{}_\rho \mathcal{T}^\rho{}_{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^\nu{}_{\lambda\rho} \mathcal{R}^{\lambda\rho}{}_{\mu\nu}, \quad (1a)$$

$$(D_\rho + \mathcal{T}^\lambda{}_{\rho\lambda}) \sigma^\rho{}_{\mu\nu} = \tau_{\mu\nu} - \tau_{\nu\mu}. \quad (1b)$$

Here, $\mathcal{T}^\lambda{}_{\mu\nu}$ and $\mathcal{R}^{\lambda\rho}{}_{\mu\nu}$ are the spacetime torsion and curvature, and $D_\mu v^\nu \equiv \partial_\mu v^\nu + \Gamma^\nu{}_{\rho\mu} v^\rho$ is the covariant derivative with the nonsymmetric connection $\Gamma^\rho{}_{\mu\nu}$. The second equation clearly shows that the antisymmetric part of the stress-energy tensor is not a dynamic variable. Indeed, given the spin tensor $\sigma^{\lambda\mu\nu}$, the antisymmetric part $\tau^{[\mu\nu]}$ is completely determined. We can use the equation (1b) to eliminate $\tau^{[\mu\nu]}$ components, and rewrite the conservation equations in terms of $\tau^{(\mu\nu)}$ and $\sigma^{\lambda\mu\nu}$ alone.

Let us briefly explain how the assumption of highly localized matter simplifies the conservation equations (1). First, we expand the stress-energy and spin tensors of the localized matter in multipoles around a suitably chosen timelike line $x^\mu = z^\mu(\tau)$. Using the results of Ref. [12], a spacetime function $F(x)$ is written as a series of δ -function derivatives:

$$F(x) = \int d\tau \left[M(\tau) \frac{\delta^{(4)}(x - z)}{\sqrt{-g}} - \nabla_\rho \left(M^\rho(\tau) \frac{\delta^{(4)}(x - z)}{\sqrt{-g}} \right) + \dots \right]. \quad (2)$$

The line parameter τ is chosen to be the proper distance, $d\tau^2 = g_{\mu\nu} dz^\mu dz^\nu$, and $\nabla_\rho \equiv D_\rho(\Gamma \rightarrow \{\})$ is the Riemannian covariant derivative. Here, $\{\lambda{}^\lambda{}_{\mu\nu}\}$ stands for the Levi-Civita connection. The expansion (2) is manifestly covariant, with the multipole coefficients $M^{\rho_1 \dots \rho_n}$ being tensors with respect to spacetime diffeomorphisms. The adopted metric signature is +2, and $g \equiv \det(g_{\mu\nu})$ is the metric determinant.

The decomposition (2) is suitable for treating matter which is well localized around the line $x^\mu = z^\mu(\tau)$. In fact, the variable $F(x)$ must drop exponentially to zero as we move away from the line if we want the series (2) to be well defined. If this is the case, the coefficients $M^{\rho_1 \dots \rho_n}$ get smaller as n gets larger. In the lowest, single-pole approximation, all higher M 's are neglected. In the

pole-dipole approximation one neglects all but the first two M -coefficients.

World line equations. We expand the stress-energy and spin tensors of the localized matter in multipoles around the line $x^\mu = z^\mu(\tau)$. Being concerned with the case of point particles, we choose to work in the single-pole approximation. Thus,

$$\tau^{(\mu\nu)} = \int d\tau c^{\mu\nu}(\tau) \frac{\delta^{(4)}(x-z)}{\sqrt{-g}}, \quad (3a)$$

$$\sigma^{\lambda\mu\nu} = \int d\tau c^{\lambda\mu\nu}(\tau) \frac{\delta^{(4)}(x-z)}{\sqrt{-g}}. \quad (3b)$$

This definition of single-pole approximation differs from what is found in the existing literature [8, 10]. There, the antisymmetric part of the stress-energy tensor $\tau^{[\mu\nu]}$ had an equal treatment as $\tau^{(\mu\nu)}$. As $\tau^{[\mu\nu]}$ is not an independent variable, this imposed unnecessary constraints on $\sigma^{\lambda\mu\nu}$. In particular, the spin of the Dirac particle was ruled out. To overcome this problem, the authors of Ref. [10] abandoned single-pole in favour of pole-dipole approximation. Their subsequent limit of vanishing orbital angular momentum brought them a non-trivial spin-curvature coupling, even in the Dirac case. In what follows, we shall demonstrate that it is not quite so.

Let us substitute (3) in (1), and solve the obtained equations in terms of the unknown variables $z^\mu(\tau)$, $c^{\mu\nu}(\tau)$ and $c^{\lambda\mu\nu}(\tau)$. The procedure is very much the same as described in Ref. [12]. First, we eliminate the equation (1b), and rewrite (1a) in terms of the independent variables $\tau^{(\mu\nu)}$ and $\sigma^{\lambda\mu\nu}$. We then multiply (1a) with an arbitrary vector valued function $f_\mu(x)$, and integrate over the spacetime. The resulting equation depends on the function f_μ and its first and second covariant derivatives, evaluated on the line $x^\mu = z^\mu(\tau)$. Owing to the arbitrariness of the function $f_\mu(x)$, the terms proportional to its independent derivatives separately vanish. The obtained equations are manifestly covariant with respect to spacetime diffeomorphisms.

Skipping the details of the calculation, which will be published elsewhere, we present here the final result. It consists of two sets of world line equations. The first is a set of algebraic equations which determine the coefficients $c^{\mu\nu}$ and $c^{\lambda\mu\nu}$ in terms of the free parameters $m(\tau)$, $s^{\mu\nu}(\tau)$ and $s^{\lambda\mu\nu}(\tau)$:

$$c^{\mu\nu} = mu^\mu u^\nu + 2u_\lambda u^{(\mu} \nabla s^{\nu)\lambda} - \frac{1}{2} K_{\lambda\rho}^{(\mu} c^{\nu)\lambda\rho}, \quad (4a)$$

$$c^{\lambda\mu\nu} = 2u^\lambda s^{\mu\nu} + s^{\lambda\mu\nu}. \quad (4b)$$

Here, $u^\mu \equiv dz^\mu/d\tau$ is the particle 4-velocity, $K_{\mu\lambda\nu} \equiv (\mathcal{T}_{\nu\mu\lambda} - \mathcal{T}_{\mu\lambda\nu} - \mathcal{T}_{\lambda\nu\mu})/2$ is the contorsion tensor, and ∇ stands for the Riemannian covariant derivative along the particle trajectory ($\nabla v^\mu = dv^\mu/d\tau + \{\frac{\mu}{\lambda\rho}\} v^\lambda u^\rho$). The parameters $s^{\mu\nu}$ and $s^{\lambda\mu\nu}$ are totally antisymmetric tensors:

$$s^{\mu\nu} = -s^{\nu\mu}, \quad s^{\lambda\mu\nu} = -s^{\lambda\nu\mu} = s^{\nu\lambda\mu}.$$

The algebraic equations (4) differ from what we find in literature by the form of (4b).

The second set of equations are the differential equations that determine the particle world line and spin precession. They read:

$$\nabla p^\mu - u^\nu s^{\rho\lambda} R^\mu{}_{\nu\rho\lambda} = \frac{1}{2} c_{\nu\rho\lambda} \nabla^\mu K^{\rho\lambda\nu}, \quad (5a)$$

$$\nabla s^{\mu\nu} + D^{\mu\nu} = u^{[\mu} p^{\nu]}, \quad (5b)$$

where

$$p^\mu \equiv mu^\mu + 2u_\rho (\nabla s^{\mu\rho} + D^{\mu\rho}),$$

$$D^{\mu\nu} \equiv c^{\rho\lambda[\nu} K^{\mu]}{}_{\lambda\rho} + \frac{1}{2} K_{\lambda\rho}^{[\mu} c^{\nu]\rho\lambda}.$$

Here, the symbol $R^\mu{}_{\nu\rho\lambda}$ stands for the Riemann curvature, $R^\mu{}_{\nu\rho\lambda} \equiv \mathcal{R}^\mu{}_{\nu\rho\lambda}(\Gamma \rightarrow \{\})$, and both external fields, $R^\mu{}_{\nu\rho\lambda}$ and $K^{\rho\lambda\nu}$, are evaluated on the line $x^\mu = z^\mu(\tau)$.

The obtained single-pole equations differ from the known pole-dipole result [7, 8, 9, 10, 11] by the presence of the constraint (4b). It is a consequence of our assumption that the particle has no thickness, and therefore no orbital degrees of freedom. In the existing literature, an analogous but more restrictive constraint appears in this regime [8, 10]. This is because the antisymmetric part of the stress-energy tensor $\tau^{[\mu\nu]}$ has been treated as an independent variable, in spite of the restriction (1b). In our approach, the only independent variables are $\sigma^{\lambda\mu\nu}$ and $\tau^{(\mu\nu)}$, and the resulting constraint (4b) is not so strong. In particular, it does not rule out the free Dirac field, or any other massive elementary field. Indeed, the formula $c^{\lambda\mu\nu} = u^\lambda s^{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{s} u^{[\mu} s^{\nu]\lambda}$ for the spin tensor of the elementary particle of spin s (see Ref. [11]) is a special case of (4b).

In what follows, we shall examine the special case of spin 1/2 pointlike matter. Surprisingly, we shall discover that spin 1/2 does not couple to the curvature, leading to geodesic trajectories in torsionless spacetimes.

Dirac particle. The basic property of Dirac matter is the total antisymmetry of its spin tensor $\sigma^{\lambda\mu\nu}$. As a consequence, the coefficients $c^{\lambda\mu\nu}$ are also totally antisymmetric, and the constraint (4b) implies

$$s^{\mu\nu} = 0.$$

The vanishing of the $s^{\mu\nu}$ component of the spin tensor has far reaching consequences. First, we see that the spin-curvature coupling disappears from the world line equation (5a). Second, the spin precession equation (5b) becomes an algebraic equation. If we define the spin vector s^μ by $s^{\mu\nu\rho} \equiv e^{\mu\nu\rho\lambda} s_\lambda$, and the axial component of the contorsion K^μ as $K^\mu \equiv e^{\mu\nu\rho\lambda} K_{\nu\rho\lambda}$, the equations (5) become

$$\nabla (mu^\mu + K^{[\mu} s^{\nu]} u_\nu) + \frac{1}{2} s^\nu \nabla^\mu K_\nu = 0, \quad (6a)$$

$$K_\perp^{[\mu} s_\perp^{\nu]} = 0. \quad (6b)$$

Here, $e_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda} \equiv \sqrt{-g}\varepsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda}$ is the covariant Levi-Civita symbol, and the decomposition of a vector into components parallel and orthogonal to the world line is used: $v^\mu \equiv v_\perp^\mu + v u^\mu$, $v_\perp^\mu u_\mu \equiv 0$. As we can see, the spin couples only to the axial component of the contorsion, which means that *Dirac point particles follow geodesic trajectories in torsionless spacetimes*. At the same time, the absence of torsion trivializes the equation (6b), and no information on the behavior of the spin vector is available.

To make it clear, only zero-size Dirac particles lack the spin-curvature coupling. In the case of thick particles (pole-dipole approximation), curvature couples to the total angular momentum, thus to both, spin and orbital angular momentum. Therefore, our result does not compromise the known pole-dipole result. It just explains its behaviour in the zero-size limit.

If the background torsion has nontrivial axial component, a geodesic deviation appears, but also a very strong constraint on the spin vector. Indeed, the equation (6b) implies that the orthogonal component of s^μ always orients itself along the background direction $K_\perp^\mu$. This unusual behavior suggests that the spin vector of the Dirac point particle might be zero, after all. In fact, the world line equations (4) and (5) are derived under very general assumptions of the existence of pointlike solutions in an arbitrary field theory. They do not care about peculiarities of specific theories, or specific types of localized solutions. What might happen in a particular theory is that additional constraints appear to ensure the existence of localized solutions. In what follows, we shall analyze the wave packet solutions of the flat space Dirac equation, with the idea to check if they can be viewed as point particles. We shall see that this is possible only if the particle spin goes to zero.

Wave packet. Wave packet is a solution which is well localized in space, but resembles a plane wave inside. To be viewed as a particle, its size ℓ is considered in the limit $\ell \rightarrow 0$. At the same time, the particle stability is achieved in the limit $\lambda/\ell \rightarrow 0$, where λ is its wavelength. We shall consider the free Dirac equation, and construct wave packets as follows. In the initial moment $t = 0$, we choose the configuration $\psi(\mathbf{r}, 0) \equiv g(\mathbf{r})\psi_p(\mathbf{r}, 0)$, where $\psi_p(x) \equiv a(k)\exp(ik_\mu x^\mu)$ is a plane wave solution of the Dirac equation, and $g(\mathbf{r}) \sim \exp(-r^2/\ell^2)$ is a function that cuts out a small piece of the plane wave. Using the Dirac equation, we can calculate time derivatives, and thereby determine its time evolution. In fact, we only need first time derivatives, as neither $\tau^{\mu\nu}$ nor $\sigma^{\lambda\mu\nu}$ depend on higher derivatives:

$$\tau_{\mu\nu} = i\bar{\psi}\gamma_\mu \overleftrightarrow{\partial}_\nu \psi, \quad \sigma^{\lambda\mu\nu} = \varepsilon^{\lambda\mu\nu\rho}\bar{\psi}\gamma_5\gamma_\rho\psi. \quad (7)$$

In addition, there is a conserved current $j^\mu = \bar{\psi}\gamma^\mu\psi$, associated with the extra $U(1)$ symmetry of the Dirac action. The wave packet expressions of these currents

are obtained straightforwardly, but we shall skip these details. Instead, we shall discuss two interesting relations that we have discovered to further constrain the currents. The first,

$$\varepsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda}\sigma^{\mu\nu\rho}j^\lambda = 0, \quad (8)$$

shows that the spin vector s^μ is orthogonal to u^μ , as expected. This follows from the fact that $j^\mu \propto u^\mu$ in the single-pole approximation. The second relation,

$$\tau^{\mu\nu}j_\nu \propto j^\mu, \quad (9)$$

has even more striking consequences. Its physical meaning is best seen in the rest frame where it takes the form $\tau^{\alpha 0} = j^\alpha = 0$. It tells us that the two currents are mutually proportional, i.e. that the energy and charge flow in the same direction. In the limit $\lambda/\ell \rightarrow 0$, one can show that it implies the constraint

$$x^\alpha \tau^{(0\beta)} - x^\beta \tau^{(0\alpha)} = \sigma^{0\alpha\beta} + \text{div}, \quad (10)$$

where div stands for the total 3-divergence. In the single-pole approximation, only the space integral of this relation is needed. Then, the divergence term disappears, and we end up with the constraint that relates the wave packet spin to its orbital angular momentum. As orbital degrees of freedom are neglected in this approximation, so is the spin. Thus, the particle *orbital angular momentum and spin disappear simultaneously* in the limit $\ell \rightarrow 0$, $\lambda/\ell \rightarrow 0$.

To summarize, we see that the spin vector s^μ vanishes in the single-pole approximation, and the particle trajectory becomes a geodesic line even in the presence of torsion. This is a valid conclusion only if Dirac point particles are viewed as zero-size wave packets. It does not apply to other localized field configurations. For example, one could consider a localized bound state of Dirac and electromagnetic fields. Its spin-tensor is still totally antisymmetric (which implies the vanishing spin-curvature coupling), but nothing proves its disappearance in the zero-size limit. The validity of the above conclusion also requires some sort of equivalence principle to hold. This is because the considered wave packet is a solution of the free Dirac equation, and the inclusion of curvature or torsion may destroy it. What we can do is to consider weak gravity, so that terms quadratic in curvature and torsion are neglected. In that case, the free wave packets are a good approximation to the exact solution, which implies that *Dirac point particles behave as spinless objects in a weak gravitational field*. They can still probe the spacetime curvature, but for the probe of the background torsion, one needs a thick particle.

Let us note here that one could use the alternative WKB approach to study Dirac field in curved backgrounds. In such an approach, the starting point is the covariant Dirac equation rather than the general conservation laws. However, whatever solution of the covariant Dirac equation is used, it must obey the covariant

conservation equations (1). This is because the conservation laws (1) are a general property of all covariant Lagrangians, the covariant Dirac Lagrangian being just one of those. Once we check that the same approximation is used in both approaches, the two predictions must not contradict each other. In particular, if the wave packet solution of the covariant Dirac equation is considered in the zero-size limit, its trajectory will belong to the class of trajectories defined by our world line equations. The WKB analysis of the covariant Dirac equation has already been considered in literature (see, for example, Ref. [13]). However, this kind of analysis is not suitable for the zero-size limit, as the considered wave configuration is far from resembling a point-particle. What is called particle trajectory in this approach is rather a ray of geometric optics.

Let us close our exposition with the speculation that Dirac particle is not the only one that possesses these features. Indeed, the relations analogous to (9) might exist quite generally. There is nothing special about the statement that all the particle charges flow in the same direction. This is something one would expect to hold for any type of localized matter. However, the consequence (10) has been derived for the Dirac wave packet solution only. If this turns out to be the general property of wave packet solutions, the disappearance of spin in the zero-

size limit might be a feature of all massive point particles.

This work was supported by the Serbian Science Foundation, Serbia.

* Electronic address: mvasilic@phy.bg.ac.yu

† Electronic address: vmarko@phy.bg.ac.yu

- [1] M. Mathisson, Acta. Phys. Pol. **6**, 163 (1937).
- [2] A. Papapetrou, Proc. R. Soc. A **209**, 248 (1951).
- [3] W. Tulczyjew, Acta Phys. Pol. **18**, 393 (1959).
- [4] A. H. Taub, J. Math. Phys. **5**, 112 (1964).
- [5] G. Dixon, Nuovo Cimento **34**, 317 (1964).
- [6] G. Dixon, Proc. R. Soc. A **314**, 499 (1970); A **319**, 509 (1970).
- [7] A. Trautman, Bull. Acad. Pol. Sci., math. astr. phys. **20**, 895 (1972).
- [8] F. W. Hehl, Phys. Lett. A **48**, 393 (1976).
- [9] P. B. Yasskin and W. R. Stoeger, Phys. Rev. D **21**, 2081 (1980).
- [10] K. Nomura, T. Shirafuji, and K. Hayashi, Prog. Theor. Phys. **86**, 1239 (1991).
- [11] K. Nomura, T. Shirafuji, and K. Hayashi, Prog. Theor. Phys. **87**, 1275 (1992).
- [12] M. Vasilic and M. Vojinovic, JHEP 07(2007)028.
- [13] J. Audretsch, Phys. Rev. D **24**, 1470 (1981).